UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,336	05/07/2007	Mikael Willgert	1920	8370

20676 7590 09/21/2011

ALFRED J MANGELS
4729 CORNELL ROAD
CINCINNATI, OH 452412433

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, NAM V	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/21/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/590,336	WILLGERT, MIKAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NAM V. NGUYEN	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 July 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to applicant's Amendment which is filed July 6, 2011.

An amendment to the claim 1 has been entered and made of record in the application of Willgert for a "method of authorization" filed May 7, 2007.

Claims 1-12 are now pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, filed July 6, 2011, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi (US# 6,819,917) in view of Nielsen (US# 7,012,503).

Referring to claim 1, Yamauchi discloses a method for granting access to a restricted area (50) (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 19; see Figures 1 to 3), said method comprising the steps of:

a mobile telephone (10) outputs a request for transmission to a central computer (20) designation of a target output (50) for a desired information by a user of the mobile telephone (10) (i.e. transmitting to central computer containing access codes a request by a user of a portable radio terminal for an access code) (column 6 lines 14 to 16; see Figures 1 and 4-5);

transmitting an authentication number (i.e. a stored access code) from the central computer (20) via radio waves to the mobile telephone (10) (i.e. a radio terminal) possessed by the user (column 4 lines 15 to 21; see Figure 1);

transmitting the access code from the portable radio terminal (10) over an IRDA (i.e. a short-range radio link) to a transmitter unit (not shown) associated with a restricted area to which access is sought by the user the access code received by the mobile telephone (10) from the central computer (20) (column 4 lines 21 to 26; see Figures 1 to 3).

However, Yamauchi did not explicitly disclose transmitting the access code from the transmitter unit associated with the restricted area to the central computer; and comparing in the central computer the access code received from the transmitter unit associated with the restricted area with the stored access code that the central computer transmitted to the radio terminal, to allow access to the restricted area when the access code received from the transmitter unit associated with the restricted area corresponds with the stored access code.

In the same field of endeavor of an access communication system, Nielsen teaches that a lock control unit (721) transmits an access code (i.e. transmitting the access code from the transmitter unit associated with the restricted area) to an access code management system (711) (i.e. the central computer) (column 18 lines 52 to 59; see Figure 7c); and comparing in the central computer (711) the access code received from the transmitter unit (721) associated with front doors of a building (i.e. the restricted area) with the stored access code that the central computer (711) transmitted to the electronic key device (701) (i.e. the radio terminal), to allow access to the restricted area when the access code received from the transmitter unit (721) associated with the restricted area corresponds with the stored access code (column 18 lines 59 to 65; see Figure 7c) in order to avoid storing the access codes in the lock control unit.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize transmitting the access code to the access code management system that the lock control unit received from the electronic device for authorization to the front door of the building taught by Nielsen in the remote output system using the mobile telephone with the user retrieves access information from the central computer of Yamauchi because transmitting the access code to the access code management system that the lock control unit received from the electronic device for authorization would provide more secure for access to a plurality of locations using a network access control system.

Referring to the claim 2, Yamauchi in view of Nielson disclose the method according to claim 1, Yamauchi discloses including the step of transmitting from the

central access code to the radio terminal (20) when an output request designation of a target output (i.e. an inquiry for an access code) is transmitted to the central computer (20) by at least one of a communication device associated with the restricted area and the radio terminal (10) (column 5 lines 13 to 26; see Figures 1 to 3).

Referring to the claims 3-4, Yamauchi in view of Nielson disclose the method according to claim 1, Yamauchi discloses wherein the radio terminal (10) is a mobile telephone constituting component of the said short-range radio link (column 4 lines 21 to 26; column 9 lines 27 to 32).

Referring to the claim 5, Yamauchi in view of Nielson disclose the method according to claim 1, Yamauchi discloses wherein the short-range radio link a Bluetooth link (column 9 lines 34 to 38).

Referring to the claim 6, Yamauchi in view of Nielson disclose the method according to claim 1, Yamauchi discloses wherein the restricted area is a computer terminal 50) to which access is desired (column 4 lines 7 to 14).

Referring to the claim 7, Yamauchi in view of Nielson disclose the method according to claim 1, Nielson disclose wherein the restricted area is a closed entryway to which access is desired so that it can be opened (column 3 lines 23 to 37; see Figure 1).

Referring to the claim 8, Yamauchi in view of Nielson disclose the method according to claim 1, Yamauchi discloses wherein the restricted area includes a device for comparing the access code received from the central computer (20) and that the access code received from the radio terminal (10) (column 5 lines 26 to 38; see Figures 1 to 3).

Referring to the claim 9, Yamauchi in view of Nielson disclose the method according to claim 1, Yamauchi discloses including the steps of: providing at the restricted area a communicator connected to the central computer (20) by a communications link (40) (column 4 lines 35 to 42; see Figure 1); and communicating from the communicator at short range with the said radio terminal (10) by at least one of an RFID link and a Bluetooth link (column 9 lines 27 to 38; see Figure 1).

2. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi (US# 6,819,917) in view of Nielsen (US# 7,012,503) as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Strobel et al. (US# 7,113,300).

Referring to claim 10, Yamauchi in view of Nielsen disclose the method according to Claim 1, however, Yamauchi in view of Nielsen did not explicitly disclose wherein the access code transmitted from the restricted area to the central computer includes a network address associated with the restricted area.

In the same field of endeavor of an access communication system, Strobel et al. teach that establish communication with a destination printing device (22) to get address

information (i.e. network address associated with the restricted area) from the destination printing device (22) by a data center (12) (column 4 lines 4 to 26; column 5 lines 47 to 65; see Figures 1, 2A and 2B) in order to provide on-demand message delivering with confidentiality.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize using establish communication with the destination printing device to get address information from the destination printing device by the data center taught by Nielsen in the remote output system using the mobile telephone with the user retrieves access information through a network of Yamauchi because using establish communication with the destination printing device to get address information from the destination printing device by the data center would provide more secure in a network access control system.

Referring to claim 11, Yamauchi in view of Nielsen disclose the method according to Claim 1, Strobel et al. disclose including the step of utilizing the access code to encrypt information that is transmitted from the restricted area to the central computer (column 4 lines 4 to 26; column 5 line 47 to column 6 line 6; see Figures 1, 2A and 2B) in order to provide on-demand message delivering with confidentiality and preventing any unauthorized party from retrieving the documents.

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi (US# 6,819,917) in view of Nielsen (US# 7,012,503) as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Camhi (US# 6,762,684).

Referring to claim 12, Yamauchi in view of Nielsen disclose the method according to Claim 1, however, Yamauchi in view of Nielsen did not explicitly disclose providing a reading device for the reading biometric data associated with the user, and transmitting user-associated biometric data from the restricted area to the central computer.

In the same field of endeavor of an access communication system, Camhi teaches that a sensor (18) (i.e. a reading device) for the reading biometric data such as fingerprint associated with the user, and transmitting the fingerprint (i.e. user-associated biometric data) from a processor (12) (i.e. the restricted area) to the central station (22) (i.e. the central computer) via a communication link (24) (column 5 lines 23 to 33; see Figures 1 to 4) in order to monitoring the operation of potentially dangerous equipment and assures that it is being operated only by authorized operators.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize having the processor transmits biometric information reading from the biometric sensor to the central station taught by Camhi in the remote output system using the mobile telephone with the user retrieves access information through a network of Yamauchi in view of Nielsen because using the processor transmits biometric information reading from the biometric sensor to the central station would provide

alternative way to monitor user accessing through the restrict area in a network access control system.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nam V Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3061. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman can be reached on 571- 272-3059. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Nam V Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2612